

9/17/68

Dear Paul,

Many thanks for your letter of 9/14, and not alone for its welcome enclosure, which I hope is no burden for you. Before answering it, I want to pass on what is not fact but is conjecture that fits only too well with certain apprehensions I have communicated to Al, among others.

I now have some of Uncle's transcripts of some of Mark's recent appearances. Until recently, he had had no such interest in Mark and had not been bothering with these transcripts. Now, however, he has a renewed interest which I can attribute to one or more of several things. Mark in his endless boasting, has provided what I regard as the central clue. He brags that the FBI sends agents into the control rooms when he broadcasts, and when Mort does. Quite obviously, it is not for the purpose of preventing the broadcasts. That it has never done and would not do when the broadcast is being aired or taped. Nor is it merely for the purpose of having a copy of what he says, which can always be done by merely recording the broadcast. The difference is that the presence of agents at the time of live broadcast of taping provides witnesses who can take the stand in court. I think the most obvious place is New Orleans.

By now the matter of John and the ms is, if this is the right word, "clarified". I spoke to him Sunday and wrote you.

I have asked the Archives for a copy of any index to CD 4.

Check on the indexes. I think the ideal thing would be if you could get this carded on the IBM things and have a master index that everyone could use.

I assent on the Quigley matter, but believe that whenever you have it settled, meaning if not completely to your satisfaction, at least to where you are satisfied you can go no further, it should be included. I think it is appropriate to any discussion of Oswald's connections. I believe that the FBI control over the investigation can be handled separately and with regard for the possible overtones as well as its open content.

What you say about "Mack Osborne" is no less than fascinating. What the Report says, as you may recall from O in N.O., is that "Oswald, using the name Osborne", got the literature from Jones. This is what the summary FBI report also says. But ~~xxxxx~~ it is not what the raw reports and Jones say. You now know why Jones told me most closely resembles the man who used the name "Osborne" in getting that literature. I cannot wait to see what you get! I assume I have the Thornley reports you next cite. I have two from the FBI, of interviews with him, the second, by the way, on his initiative. Simco becomes more and more interesting. We can assume there was a certain amount of error from incorrect recollection, but how could Simco have known Oswald was in Mexico that fast? Does this Murdoch report ask questions about the FBI omissions? Thornley told people I cannot use but who told me of overhearing when he was at the office with the agents, I think at night, what is a close approximation of the Cheramie incident. In any event, as the note I'd already included in your envelope says, my letter to Murdoch was returned because he is no longer a Grand Prairie cop. They made no effort to forward it. I presume they know his whereabouts.

Hastily,

Harold Eisberg

9/17/68, p.m.

Dear Paul,

After my earlier letter today I heard from Louis. He has not received the numbers I suggested you send him, with the request that when he could he have Jeff check them out. He says if you will send them he will do it.

As I had earlier indicated, Tom is about to leave. He is working now only part time and has filed a few job applications. From time to time there may be some things Louis wants checked out. I have told him of the current status of our index project and am sending him your address. He may ask that certain names be checked through what we have. If you do this for him and items show up that we do not have, if you will send the identifications to me, if I do not have them I will get them and forward them to him.

Right now, please run through all the indexes when you can for Dave Cherry. I know of this interest. I suggest that you include any reference to Youngblood. I know of the limited testimony, but I have never checked the documents on this. I will be making a formal request for everything that shows in the things the Archives checks, but there are often things we can find that they do not. Whatever shows in the Arch. you will know because I will send you copies, as I will to Louis. I tell you this because what we do may cross in the mail.

Please, again, as soon as you can, get after Jonn on his part of the check on this. I know that one of the problems is \$15.00. Perhaps Jonn can turn over to Hal what leads his has other than what he already has. I think it would be a good idea if Hal could personally check the court files and see the lawyer, making one of his customary thorough memos, with copies to Louis and me. I should get two so I can forward one with the picture, if and when we get it, to where the picture will be checked. The person who will do that for me will not know the entire story. This information should help him.

I am trying other means of getting a picture, from the promo material. So far it has not yielded anything. I think Jonn can get one of his media friends to get me a copy of the picture if he is leaned on enough. Hal is heavier than you.

Until I send you another address, address Louis at the office or, if you think best, through Tom, as you have been writing him.

Best regards

Harold Weissberg

P.S. Louis shares the apprehension, as I earlier knew. If there is anything of this sort that occurs out there or has occurred and of which there is a record, please sent it to me so I can send it to him. His purpose will be to show it to a single staff lawyer only.